



TITLE:

## <Note>Chinese Subcommunal Elites in 19th century Penang

AUTHOR(S):

Mak, Lau-Fong

---

CITATION:

Mak, Lau-Fong. <Note>Chinese Subcommunal Elites in 19th century Penang. 東南アジア研究 1987, 25(2): 254-264

ISSUE DATE:

1987-09

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/56280>

RIGHT:

## Chinese Subcommunal Elites in 19th-Century Penang

MAK Lau-Fong\*

### Abstract

Based on published inscriptional data, the paper attempts to study a group of Chinese subcommunal elites in 19th-century Penang. The group comprises in general the social and the economic elite. The former is gauged by their frequency in donating to the many Chinese voluntary associations, and the latter by the total amount donated throughout the 19th century.

It is found that the Hokkiens produced a disproportionately large group of social elites, in comparison with other contemporary Chinese speech groups. While the well-spread Hokkien economic elite also dominated the Chinese community in Penang, the group's ascendancy was curtailed and checked by the Cantonese/Hakka elite whose top donor's contributions dwarfed that of his Hokkien counterpart.

The Hokkien elite is said to have been drawn from five major clans by the surnames Chen, Lin, Qiu, Xie and Yang. The Qius were the most influential group, but the Yangs' status seems to have been inappropriately conferred.

### Introduction

While Chinese of different dialect origins emigrated chiefly from the two coastal provinces, namely Fujian and Quandong, they did not subsequently reside together in all recipient settlements. It seems that those who migrated to the American continent were of relatively homogeneous speech-group origins. Their demographic composition displayed such an overwhelming dominance by a particular speech group that speech divergence had never become a problem of social solidarity internally. Chinese immigrants to Southeast Asia, however, having been segmented into heterogeneous dialect groups, had to work and interact with one another in close

proximity despite their differences. This is especially the case with those settling in the former British Straits Settlements, i.e. Malacca, Penang and Singapore (and later Malaya), many of whom were contract labourers working at tin mining sites and plantations of various kinds.

Among the early Chinese immigrants in the 19th century, circumstantial evidence indicates that the Hokkiens had demographically been the major dialect group in each of the three Settlements. Population census data establish their numerical dominance from 1881 to 1901. In Penang in particular, the Hokkiens had a clear dominance of 50% (inclusive of 20% of the Straits-born Chinese) in 1881, 55% (Straits-born 23%) in 1891 and 61% (Straits-born 26%) in 1901 [Mak 1985: 71]. The second biggest dialect group for

\* Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, Singapore 0511

the same period was the Cantonese, with a dominance of 20% in 1881, 23% in 1891 and 22% in 1901. The third and fourth largest Chinese dialect groups were respectively the Teochius and Hakkas.

The Hokkien subcommunity was never regarded as homogeneous, but as being composed of five clans as their anchor groups. The population census data unfortunately do not yield information on the numerical dominance of any of the five clans. The supposed relative prominence results simply from the assertions of a number of scholars. For instance, both Tan [Chen and Tan 1972] and Imahori [1974: 56–65] felt that the five surname groups from Fujian had been most influential in 19th-century Penang; these are generally identified as the Chens, Lins, Qius, Xies, and Yangs. Except for the Chens, the other four surname groups had, before emigration, been living in China in mono-surname communes exclusively. It is therefore not surprising to find from the relevant inscriptions that each of these four clans at one time would accept as members only those who were related to the respective mono-surname communes in China [Franke and Chen 1985: 856–74; 883–7; 903–5]. Despite the individualized membership criteria, the five clans were close to one another on a number of occasions. For instance, the heads of the clans had in the late 1870s served together with others as directors of the Chenhuang miao [*ibid.*: 598–601].

The principal task of the present inquiry is to study some of the socio-economic characteristics of the perceivedly dominant

Hokkien group and its components. In the process, the more reputable members of these groups will be individually identified.

These elites shall comprise two major types: the social and the economic. After analyzing the 15 Chinese leaders who were indisputably in elite positions in 19th-century Singapore, Yong [1967] identified wealth as the most important single factor for becoming a leader, alongside linguistic ability and connections with the contemporary secret societies. Yen [1986: 82–3] even states categorically that “wealth determined social mobility and enabled people to acquire titles and political influence. So wealth facilitated the acquisition of clan leadership.” Both of these writers are dealing with people who possessed power, popularity and/or base resources such as wealth, social status and special skills.

In the present study, the elites to be identified are those who had been outstanding in relation to certain socio-economic events, where the possession of followers was not essential. The typology of elites is, of course, empirically determined rather than conceptually constructed. Financial status, which is readily available from the published inscriptional data, is taken here to characterize the economic elite, a type which is locally and customarily known as ‘towkay’.

On the other hand, a member of the social elite is one who excels in some kind of social behaviour or practice with the intention of distinguishing himself. Large-scale financial donation is a behaviour which typifies a social elite status. Writers have

usually subsumed or mixed up this type of elite status with the economic elite status, for lack of information on the former category's financial position. Historical and official documents do not normally contain information on personal wealth known or unknown to others. But to differentiate a member of the social elite from that of the economic elite for analytical purposes, it is imperative to know, first, the person's performance in the social arena and second, his comparative financial position. It is fortunate that information about the two conditions is obtainable from the inscriptions.<sup>1)</sup>

Wealth may be hidden. So the towkays who qualify for our study are those who had expended their wealth in exchange for social recognition. The means of exchange in question was to make contributions, especially financial ones to the many types of voluntary associations. While a social leader at the subcommunal level might well be a member of the social elite, the reverse was not necessarily so. The former may establish himself through the institutional position he occupied in any voluntary association, whereas the latter is decided by the frequency of donation within a specific time period.

### Data Collection

Inscriptions compiled and edited by

1) There are limitations in using inscriptional data to identify Chinese elites of both types. One limitation is that those who had not donated to subcommunal associations, or whose donations could not measure up to our criteria, must be bypassed.

Franke and Chen [1985] constitute the primary source of the present study. All personal names inscribed on any commemorative objects erected in the 19th century were processed with the help of a micro-computer. Entries associated with each personal name are: the type and name of the voluntary association to which the person had made a donation, the amount and year of the donation, the speech-group origins of the donor, and other reference items.

The temporal coverage includes, in principle, all inscriptions set up during the 19th century. However, one inscription established in 1795 and a few others in the first decade of the present century are also included, mainly for the sake of continuity. That is, donors who had contributed in the 19th century would have their 1795 or 20th-century donations included.

Out of the 14,000 or so romanized personal names, 350 (representing 49 donors) were selected for analysis. Each of them donated a minimum of \$1,000, or contributed on five occasions at least, to any voluntary association. The amount of each donation made by most donors was normally spelt out in the inscription except for such symbolic contributions as serving on a committee or giving away a plot of land. Symbolic contributions merely supplement specific amounts of donations.

The speech-group origin of each donor required some extra effort to identify. This involved applying multiple and uni-dimensional criteria. The speech-group origin of a donor was taken as definite when it is declared in the title of the inscription

piece. Whenever this was unsatisfactory, the text of the inscription was scrutinized for identification purpose.

The next residual step was to associate the person with the speech-group origin of the principal donors of the association concerned. Should all three methods fail, reference was then made to some other sources, such as commemorative magazines published by the association concerned or other related associations.

Chinese voluntary associations in 19th-century Penang may be widely categorized into three kinds. First, the unrestrictive integrative associations which were patronized by people of any speech origins, which in the present case comprises mainly people from Fujian and Guangdong provinces. The second kind refers to the provincially integrative associations which accepted as members mostly those from the same province. The third kind comprises speech-group-bound or locality-specific associations.

The speech-group origins of donors contributing to a speech-bound association is self-determining, but those of the donors to integrative associations called for further analysis, involving the following assumptions. People who had contributed to both a speech-bound and an integrative body were assumed to share the speech-group origin of the speech-bound body. It was also assumed that those who had donated consistently and frequently to a speech group belonged to that group, despite their occasional contributions to other speech groups.

### The Analysis

Two major types of subcommunal elite status have been identified. For the purposes of this study, a member of the social elite is one who made at least five contributions to any voluntary associations throughout the 19th century, while a member of the economic elite is one who made a total donation of at least \$1,000.

These measures place the Hokkiens on a much higher elite level than the Cantonese and Hakkas. Table 1 shows that among the 41 donors who had donated at least five times, 37 were of Hokkien origin, as compared to four non-Hokkiens. One Hakka donated nine times, but five Hokkiens donated just as frequently or more so. Indeed, one Hokkien by the name Lin Huazhan (Lim Huachan or Lim Huachiam) made 17 donations. His total explicit or indicated amount of donations stood at \$529. He must have been a social leader, for he had served as a director to a number of voluntary associations between 1872 and 1907.

Lin was director of the Fujian Public Cemetery in 1880, 1886, 1890 and 1892. He was also director to two other Hokkien-based public cemeteries, two temples, and an unrestrictive integrative association known as Pingzhang gonghui. Lin made an explicit donation on only one of the nine occasions when he was made a director. It could be argued that directorship presumed substantial monetary contribution. Thus, in all probability he would have made donations to the associations in question under a pseudonym or under the

**Table 1** Year-specific Frequency of Donations Made by Social Elite

| Amount of Donations | Frequency of Donations |   |      |   |     |    |    |    | No. of Donations | No. of Donors |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|------|---|-----|----|----|----|------------------|---------------|
|                     | 5                      | 6 | 7    | 8 | 9   | 10 | 15 | 17 |                  |               |
| Below \$ 1,000      | 10[1]                  | 6 | 6[1] | 3 | 1   | 1  |    | 1  | 188[12]          | 28[2]         |
| \$ 1,000            | 0[1]                   | 1 | 2    | 1 |     |    |    |    | 28[ 5]           | 4[1]          |
| \$ 2,000            | 1                      |   | 1    |   |     | 1  |    |    | 34               | 3             |
| \$ 6,000            |                        |   |      |   |     |    | 1  |    | 15               | 1             |
| \$ 8,000            | 1                      |   |      |   |     |    |    |    | 5                | 1             |
| \$14,000            |                        |   |      |   | [1] |    |    |    | 0[ 9]            | 0[1]          |
| Total: Hokkiens     | 12                     | 7 | 9    | 4 | 1   | 2  | 1  | 1  | 270              | 37            |
| Cantonese/Hakkas    | [2]                    |   | [1]  |   | [1] |    |    |    | [26]             | [4]           |

stamp of his shop or company.

Having learned that Lin's other given name was Ruzhou, activities related to the latter name were also included for tabulation. As far as the available published inscriptional data and operational definition of economic elite are concerned, Lin belonged only to the social elite.

The range of influence as given remained at a subcommunal level. Not until involvement in unrestrictive integrative organizations is apparent, or cross participation is evident, could the magnitude of such influence attain to the community level as a whole. Cross participation is defined as involvement in the activities of a speech-group to which the donor does not belong. There were two Hokkien members of the social elite who were also cross participants, whereas none of their Hakka/Cantonese counterparts was. Qiu Tiande (Khoo Thean Teik) and Zhang Dexin were the two members of the elite who made donations to a Guangdong provincial association and a Hainanese association

respectively. In effect, the social elite of both the Hokkien and non-Hokkien groups had actively affiliated themselves with integrative organizations such as Pingzhang gonghui and Jile si.

The Hokkiens were accorded an unrivalled position not only by virtue of the large size of their social elite, but also because of the total number of donations made by their economic elite. The 37 Hokkien members of the social elite made a total of 270 donations, more than ten times the four Cantonese/Hakka donors' 26 donations.

The Hokkien towkays' economic power was also unassailable as compared to that of their Cantonese/Hakka counterparts. The estimated total amount donated by the Hokkien economic elite was \$45,489, while the latter gave only \$15,816 (Table 2). To standardize the amounts over a series of ten-year periods, the Hokkiens in general also out-performed the Cantonese and Hakkas, except for the decade between 1890-1899.

Another characteristic of the Cantonese

**Table 2** Year-specific Donations Made by Economic Elite

| Speech Groups        | Year (1850–1910) |             |             |             |             |             | Total Amount | No. of Donors |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
|                      | 1850<br>–59      | 1860<br>–69 | 1870<br>–79 | 1880<br>–89 | 1890<br>–99 | 1900<br>–10 |              |               |
| Hokkiens             | \$ 234           | \$ 1,108    | \$ 864      | \$ 13,013   | \$ 3,058    | \$ 27,212   | \$ 45,489    | 15            |
| Hakkas/<br>Cantonese | —                | 140         | —           | 1,200       | 6,760       | 7,716       | 15,816       | 4             |

and Hakka donation pattern is their highly individualistic response to communal needs. This is evident from the grossly uneven contributions made by their sole three members of the economic elite, of whom Zheng Jingui (Chung Kengkwee or Ah Quee) alone accounted for about 92% (Table 3). Zheng is indisputably the century's biggest patron of all. Apart from a plot of land given to the Guangdong and Dingzhou Public Cemetery, he alone donated \$14,516 after 1860, a sum that towers over the top Hokkien donor's \$8,480.

While the other two members of the economic elite were Cantonese, Zheng was a Hakka. His largest single donation,

totalling \$6,000, was made to the temple known as Jile si in 1906, presumably posthumously, for he died in 1901 [Franke and Chen 1985: 704; Wong 1963: 80]. His was the fifth largest donation after others amounting to \$35,000, \$10,000, and two separate donations of \$7,000. The mean amount of donations to the temple for that year was \$739. Zheng's second largest donation was made in 1898 to the Wufu school set up mainly for the Guangdong people, when he was its director. He also donated a sum of \$600 to the integrative Pingzhang gonghui in 1886.

Zheng's wealthy status has never been subject to question. Besides being one of the biggest tin mine owners in the Straits

**Table 3** Year-specific Donations Made by Top Three Donors

| Donors                   | Year (1850–1910) |             |             |             |             |             | Total  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
|                          | 1850<br>–59      | 1860<br>–69 | 1870<br>–79 | 1880<br>–89 | 1890<br>–99 | 1900<br>–10 |        |
| <i>Hokkiens:</i>         | \$               | \$          | \$          | \$          | \$          | \$          | \$     |
| Qiu Hanyang              |                  |             |             | 5           | 60          | 8,415       | 8,480  |
| Qiu Tiande               | 24               | 36          | 410         | 4,960       | 1,424       |             | 6,854  |
| Chen Xixiang             |                  |             |             | 12          |             | 5,500       | 5,512  |
| <i>Hakkas/Cantonese:</i> |                  |             |             |             |             |             |        |
| Zheng Jingui             |                  | 140         |             | 1,200       | 7,176       | 6,000       | 14,516 |
| Wu Jihe                  |                  | 1,000       |             | 300         |             |             | 1,300  |
| Ye Jinsheng              |                  |             |             |             | 1,000       | 300         | 1,300  |

Note: The fourth Hokkien top donor was Yan Wumei who had made two donations amounting to \$4,060 in 1886 and 1906. Huo Jinzhi, a Cantonese, who was also the top fourth donor, donated a total of \$1,168.6 to three voluntary associations during 1898 and 1906.

**Table 4** Year-specific Frequency of Donations Made by Social Elite of the Five Clans

| The Five Clans | Year (1850-1910) |         |         |         |         |         | Total | No. of Donors |
|----------------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------------|
|                | 1850-59          | 1860-69 | 1870-79 | 1880-89 | 1890-99 | 1900-10 |       |               |
| The Qius       | 6                | 4       | 11      | 24      | 14      | 4       | 63    | 8             |
| The Lins       | 3                | 3       | 7       | 16      | 16      | 4       | 49    | 7             |
| The Xies       | 2                | 2       | 2       | 5       | 3       | 0       | 14    | 2             |
| The Chens      | 1                | 1       | 2       | 4       | 3       | 1       | 12    | 2             |
| The Yangs*     | 0                | 0       | 1       | 6       | 1       | 0       | 8     | 1             |

\* The Yang clan was said to have been founded in 1844, but only its 1900 piece of inscription is available. The name of this particular donor (Yang Zhangliu) was not shown in the piece.

Settlements, he had also served as a Kapitan China. His generous donations to the various voluntary associations are therefore not surprising at all.

Next we look at the donational behaviour of the five core groups of the Hokkien subcommunity, i.e. the Chens, Lins, Qius, Xies and Yangs, in order to ascertain their social as well as economic influence. The general finding about these five Hokkien clans is that they were actually only four insofar as social and economic influences are concerned. Information contained in Tables 4 and 5 points to this conclusion. The Yang clan does not seem to have had a single member of the social or economic elite. The only likely member of the social

elite coming from the Yang family in 19th-century Penang was Yang Zhangliu, who had donated to or served as a director of some voluntary organizations a total of eight times. Nevertheless, a number of his contemporaries by other surnames, who might not have formed any formal clan associations as did the Yangs, were in fact well ahead of this sole donor in terms of their frequency of donation.

The Yangs were not great donors either. Their top donor in 19th-century Penang was Yang Xiumiao, who donated a total of only \$538, far short of what would qualify him as a member of the economic elite. Again, there were other contemporary surname collectivities which had made

**Table 5** Year-specific Donations Made by Economic Elite of the Five Clans

| The Five Clans | 1850-59 | 1860-69 | 1870-79 | 1880-89  | 1890-99  | 1900-10  | Total     | No. of Donors |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| The Qius       | \$ 24   | \$ 36   | \$ 430  | \$ 5,137 | \$ 1,596 | \$ 9,415 | \$ 16,638 | 3             |
| The Chens      |         |         | 252     | 640      | 380      | 8,700    | 9,972     | 3             |
| The Lins       |         |         |         | 216      | 600      | 7,000    | 7,816     | 3             |
| The Xies       | 40      | 32      | 12      | 960      | 30       |          | 1,074     | 1             |
| The Yangs*     |         |         |         | 26       | 12       | 500      | 538       | 1             |

\* This refers to a sole donor by the name Yang Xiumiao who was the top donor among the Yangs in 19th-century Penang. He was not an economic elite according to our definition.



larger donations. It is therefore appropriate to rule out for the time being the Yang clan as one of the core groups of the Hokkien subcommunity, pending fresh data in support of their long-claimed status.

The remaining four clans, however, were indeed influential in terms of mass and substantial contributions. Of the 37 members of the social elite in the whole Hokkien subcommunity (Table 1, above) during the period in question, more than half of them (54%) came from the four clans. These clans also made about 54% of the total number of contributions. (Table 4).

The impact of the economic elite of the four clans was even more profound. All Hokkien economic elite had contributed a total of \$45,489 (Table 2, above), 79% of which were accounted for by the economic elite from the four clans.

Not all the four clans were of equal strength. The Qius' unmatched influence outshone that of the other three in both social and economic status. As can be seen from Tables 4 and 5, the Qius had eight members of the social elite who had made a total of 63 donations. Next in rank were the Lins, who had produced seven members of the social elite with a total of 49 donations.

The total amount of donation of \$16,638, mainly given by three economic donors (Table 5) of the Qius, virtually leaves the other clans no room for comparison. The Chens donated a total of \$9,972, the Lins, \$7,816 and the Xies, \$1,074. Besides, the Qius had in fact been the consistently most active since the 1850s; they had been involved in communal activities for those

years specified between 1850s and 1900s.

## Conclusion

In Malacca and Singapore, the Chinese from Zhangzhou and Quanzhou prefectures were among the earliest, if not the earliest Chinese immigrants. It was partly because of this that the Zhang and Quan Hokkiens formed the core elements of the Hokkien subcommunity. In the case of Singapore, the Zhang-Quan people's activities centered around Hengshan ting (erected 1830), while those in Malacca centered around Qingyun ting (erected 1673). Fundamentally these two organizations also served as administrative centres of their burial business.

Except for the Chens, whose members had come from a wider range of localities in China, the Lins, Qius, Xies, and even the Yangs, were each from a mono-surname commune in Zhangzhou fu (prefecture) [Chen and Tan 1972: 16; Imahori 1974: 56-65]. Apart from the regular activities revolving presumably around their individual clan associations, the big four were also prominently affiliated to the various public cemeteries and temples such as Chenhuang miao. But this does not imply that the influence of the elite of these four surname groups was confined only to their own subcommunity; many of them were directors of the unrestrictive integrative associations such as Pingzhang gonghui, Dayuan futang and Quangfu gong. A paradox to be solved at this juncture is: While being so rigid about their membership criteria, why were the four clan-oriented

surname groups so community-oriented?

Part of the answer has been provided by Yong [1967] in his account of the emergence of the Singapore Chinese leadership. He remarks that leaders must be inclined to dispose of part of their wealth in order to gain social recognition, which in turn would place them on the upper level of the social ladder where business opportunities were more rewarding. Donation to voluntary associations was certainly an efficient way to achieve such a goal.

As many of the leaders were tin miners, plantation owners and excise farmers, they must have established the necessary contacts with the Colonial Government. To the colonial officers, who were by and large ignorant of the Chinese dialects and customs, it would be natural to trust mainly those Chinese who were better known to their own folks.

Part of the answer to the question lies also in the efficiency of political administration. It would be more effective for the British to deal with a chamber-of-commerce-like body than with a multitude of dialect-group associations individually.<sup>2)</sup> Thus, the unrestrictive integrative associations of a non-religious nature, such as Pingzhang gonghui, were possibly the creation of the Colonial Government in order to maintain law and order more effectively.

2) While the Colonial Government's intention is clear, it was not applied to all types of such integrative organizations. For example, the various Buddhist temples such as Dasheng futang and Guangfu gong could not have been the construct of the British. Axiomatically and customarily they were likely to be the creation of the Chinese themselves.

The final answer to the paradox has to be researched historically elsewhere.

There was at least one type of social organization that was functionally equivalent to an integrative organization, and which was not imposed on by the British—the Triad style Chinese secret societies. To the British, the existence of secret societies was a social as well as a political problem. Chinese secret societies were seen as illegitimate autonomous states within the legitimate state. But to the Chinese, they represented an important form of social organization for mobilizing labourers, for social control within the community, for protecting their own labour-recruitment business, and for providing security for their own folks against competition from other ethnic groups. To a much lesser extent and only occasionally, these societies were also part of the political machinery of the China Triad during the Qing Dynasty. The function of secret societies as a mechanism to unite the various segmented speech groups at a higher level was at least latent, if not manifested.

The secret society was such a mammoth conglomerate in the 19th-century Straits Settlements that it certainly had a great impact on the lives of the immigrants. That it had been a crucial source of power and wealth for many Chinese aspiring to be leaders is not an over-statement. This is precisely why Yong's [1967] 15 Singapore Chinese leaders were found to have been connected with the secret societies in one way or another. The Penang Chinese elites were no exception. The patriarch of the Qiu family, Tiande, was also the leader

of the well-known Toa Peh Kong society. Zheng Jingui was a confirmed headman of the Hai San society for years. If Imahori [1974: 63] was right to point out that the 'five' surname groups were basically clan-based, their involvement in the integrative organizations could not have been a natural inclination.

Would such a link signify the genuine interest of the Hokkiens in general and of the anchor groups in particular in the welfare of the Chinese community as a whole? The genuine interest might not even be there, for "it would be idealistic to suggest that the merchants were altruistic and obliged to look after the welfare of their countrymen from the same district or prefecture" [Yen 1986: 55].

Did it matter that such a link was in effect only instrumental? It simply did not matter, especially for those who had finally made the grade after many years' deprivation and sufferings back home in China. Emerging as a member of the elite would thus become a common goal for those immigrants who had acquired wealth. To hide one's wealth is, as a famous Chinese proverb goes, to stroll in the dark alley while wearing fine clothes. To satisfy the psychological need for social recognition is, perhaps, what prompted the many members of the social and economic elites to surface at all levels in the early Straits Settlements.

contained in the paper. It should be noted also that this paper is derived from a research project funded by both the Tan Kah Kee Foundation and the Department of Sociology of the National University of Singapore.

### Glossary

|                   |              |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Chen Xixiang      | 陳西祥          |
| Chenhuang miao    | 城隍廟          |
| Dasheng futang    | 大生佛堂         |
| Dayuan futang     | 大圓佛堂         |
| Dingzhou          | 汀州           |
| Ghee Hin          | 義興           |
| Guangfu gong      | 廣福宮          |
| Hai San           | 海山           |
| Hengshan ting     | 恆山亭          |
| Huo Jinzhi        | 霍錦芝          |
| Jile si           | 極樂寺          |
| Lin               | 林            |
| Pingzhang gonghui | 平章公會         |
| Qingyun ting      | 青雲亭          |
| Qiu Hanyang       | 邱漢陽          |
| Quanzhou          | 泉州           |
| Ruzhou            | 汝舟 (林)       |
| Tiande            | 天德 (邱)       |
| Toa Peh Kong      | 大伯公          |
| Wufu              | 五福 (書院)      |
| Wu Jihe           | 伍積賀          |
| Xie               | 謝            |
| Yan Wumei         | 顏伍美          |
| Yang Xiumiao      | 楊秀苗          |
| Yang Zhangliu     | 楊章柳          |
| Ye Jinsheng       | 葉錦勝          |
| Zhangzhou fu      | 漳州府          |
| Zheng Jingui      | 鄭景貴 (慎之, 嗣文) |

### Acknowledgement

He is thankful to the anonymous readers for their comments, and to Dr Geoffrey Benjamin for his effort in making intelligible some key ideas

## Appendix 1 The Social Elite

| No. | Names of Donors      | Period    | No. of Donation 5 |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1   | Lin Huazhan (林花鑽)    | 1872-1907 | 17                |
| 2   | Qiu Tiande (邱天德)     | 1851-91   | 15                |
| 3   | Wang Wenqing (王文慶)   | 1856-1892 | 10                |
| 4   | Ke Rumei (柯汝梅)       | 1856-1906 | 10                |
| 5   | Zheng Jingui* (鄭景貴)  | 1865-1906 | 9                 |
| 6   | Qiu Sifang (邱泗方)     | 1825-91   | 9                 |
| 7   | Yang Zhangliu (楊章柳)  | 1877-91   | 8                 |
| 8   | Xie Yunxie (謝允協)     | 1856-90   | 8                 |
| 9   | Qiu Rucuo (邱如磋)      | 1878-91   | 8                 |
| 10  | Zhang zhenyian (張正淵) | 1865-90   | 8                 |
| 11  | Gan Yingxi (甘迎禧)     | 1879-90   | 7                 |
| 12  | Hu Taixing (胡泰興)     | 1837-86   | 7                 |
| 13  | Ding Daogu (丁道姑)     | 1880-1906 | 7                 |
| 14  | Yan Jinshui (顏金水)    | 1864-92   | 7                 |
| 15  | Gan Qiupo (甘秋波)      | 1856-90   | 7                 |
| 16  | Chen Jinqing (陳錦慶)   | 1886-1906 | 7                 |
| 17  | Xu Qianli (徐千里)      | 1880-1906 | 7                 |
| 18  | Qiu Youyong (邱有用)    | 1877-1906 | 7                 |
| 19  | Qiu Tianlai (邱天來)    | 1877-1906 | 7                 |
| 20  | Lin Baide (林百德)      | 1856-90   | 6                 |
| 21  | Lian Zhanchun (連鑽春)  | 1880-91   | 6                 |
| 22  | Luo Jiang* (羅江)      | 1886-1906 | 6                 |
| 23  | Li Guongye (李光椰)     | 1856-90   | 6                 |
| 24  | Hu Yanheng (胡淵衡)     | 1856-90   | 6                 |
| 25  | Li Qingji (李清吉)      | 1856-86   | 6                 |
| 26  | Lin ningzhuo (林寧綽)   | 1880-1906 | 6                 |
| 27  | Wang Zhende (王振德)    | 1864-92   | 6                 |
| 28  | Qiu Yuanjie (邱源捷)    | 1856-82   | 6                 |
| 29  | Qiu Yuanmei (邱源美)    | 1856-82   | 6                 |
| 30  | Lin Rende (林仁德)      | 1856-80   | 5                 |
| 31  | Cai Xinbang (蔡新榜)    | 1862-66   | 5                 |
| 32  | Lin Kequan (林克全)     | 1886-1906 | 5                 |
| 33  | Xie Youcai (謝有菜)     | 1856-90   | 5                 |
| 34  | Qiu Hanyang (邱漢陽)    | 1883-1907 | 5                 |
| 35  | Lin Jinxiang (林錦祥)   | 1886-1906 | 5                 |
| 36  | Lin Baitian (林百甜)    | 1856-93   | 5                 |
| 37  | Li Wenji (李文吉)       | 1880-86   | 5                 |
| 38  | Zhang Dexin (張德新)    | 1879-91   | 5                 |
| 39  | Huo Jinzhi (霍錦芝)     | 1898-1906 | 5                 |
| 40  | Chen Heshui (陳合水)    | 1856-80   | 5                 |
| 41  | Cai Zhichu (蔡紫初)     | 1862-86   | 5                 |

\* Cantonese or Hakkas

## Appendix 2 The Economic Elite

| No. | Names of Donors     | Period    | Amount |
|-----|---------------------|-----------|--------|
| 1   | Zheng Jingui* (鄭景貴) | 1865-1906 | 14516  |
| 2   | Qiu Hanyang (邱漢陽)   | 1883-1907 | 8480   |
| 3   | Qiu Tiande (邱天德)    | 1851-91   | 6854   |
| 4   | Chen Xixiang (陳西祥)  | 1878-1906 | 5512   |
| 5   | Yan Wumei (顏伍美)     | 1886-1907 | 4060   |
| 6   | Chen Xichun (陳西村)   | 1878-1906 | 2440   |
| 7   | Wang Wenqing (王文慶)  | 1856-1892 | 2380   |
| 8   | Lin Kequan (林克全)    | 1886-1906 | 2160   |
| 9   | Chen Jinqing (陳錦慶)  | 1886-1906 | 2020   |
| 10  | Hu Yanheng (胡淵衡)    | 1856-90   | 1980   |
| 11  | Yan Jinshui (顏金水)   | 1864-92   | 1942   |
| 12  | Xu Sizhang (許泗漳)    | 1856-80   | 1530   |
| 13  | Lin Ningzhuo (林寧綽)  | 1880-1906 | 1456   |
| 14  | Qiu Tianlai (邱天來)   | 1877-1906 | 1304   |
| 15  | Ye Jinsheng* (葉錦勝)  | 1891-1906 | 1300   |
| 16  | Wu Jihe* (伍積賀)      | 1862-1886 | 1300   |
| 17  | Lin Hongshi (林紅柿)   | 1886-1906 | 1200   |
| 18  | Xie Yunxie (謝允協)    | 1856-90   | 1074   |
| 19  | Huo Jinzhi (霍錦芝)    | 1898-1906 | 1169   |

\* Cantonese or Hakkas

## References

- Chen Ching Ho; and Tan Yeok Seong. 1972. *Xinjiapo huawen beiming jilu* [A Collection of Singapore Chinese Inscriptions]. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong Press.
- Franke, W.; and Chen T. F. 1985. *Chinese Epigraphic Materials in Malaysia, Vol. 2*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Imahori, Seiji. 1974. *Malaiya huaren shehui* [The Chinese Society in Malaya]. Translated by Liu Guoying. Penang: Penang Jiaying Huiguan.
- Mak Lau-Fong. 1985. *Fangyuanqun rentong* [Dialect Group Identity]. *Monograph Series B*, No. 14. Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.
- Wong C. S. 1963. *A Gallery of Chinese Kapitans*. Singapore: Dewan Bahasa.
- Yen Ching Hwang. 1986. *A Social History of the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya, 1800-1911*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Yong Ching Fatt. 1967. Chinese Leadership in 19th-Century Singapore. *Xinshe Xuebao* [Journal of the Island Society] 1(1): 6-12.